VSP Public Comment

From: simpleasures4697@sbcglobal.net
Sent: Sunday, June 26, 2005 7:22 AM
To: Secretary of State, Constituent Affairs
Cc: McDannold, Bruce
Subject: Standards for AVVPAT

Should Calfornia reject the proposed Diebold system? Vote=Yes

Dear Mr. McDannold
It is of the utmost importance to preserve and protect the integrity of our elections.
After the debacle in the 2000 presidential election where a single vote by a supreme court
justice decided the election and the many irregularities documented in Ohio last year the
electorate is losing faith in our ability to have free and fair elections where every vote
is counted. California has a responsibility to its citizens to insure that there is a
clear and fair way to do that particularly when an election is very close or in doubt. We
can not do that when the solution to paperless electronic voting comes from the company
that has gone a long way in creating this problem by claiming that their source code is
'propriety property' and not subject to review by local, state or national figures whose
job it is to oversee elections. It should also be noted with some alarm that Diebold
owner, creator and CEO was Chuck Hagel, the Republican senator from Nebraska who in
interviews proir to !
the election assured the White House that he would deliver Ohio to the Bush team. I, of
course can not give you a smoking gun proving that Diebold has manipulated the way their
machines reported the results of any given return, but the appearance of conflict of
interest here must be eliminated if we are to regain th trust of the electorate. The
Citizens Proposed Requirments do just that. Clear readable type, permanant ink record and
most importantly an easy format to do recounts when necessary. We deserve nothing less.

Mr. Harvey Dosik
177 Hollywood Ave.
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Citizen Proposed Standards:

The AVVPAT shall be printed on single sheet non-thermal at least 16 pound paper, one
record of vote per sheet.

Every recorded vote, no matter how recorded, shall have a AVVPAT copy.

The AVVPAT record of the vote shall be printed in a minimum of 12 point font.

The AVVPAT shall be printed and organized to be easily read by both the voter and election
officials.

The AVVPAT during the 1% manual audit and any recount shall be physically verified and
hand counted only.

The recorded vote choices on the AVVPAT shall not be audited or recounted by automatic or
electronic methods.

There shall not be a method by which any particular voting record can be connected to any
particular voter.

Any AVVPAT spoiled or rejected by a voter because of a voting system error shall not be
counted as a spoiled ballot under the two spoiled ballots limit.

No remote access to voting machines by wireless or internet.